

\$1.00 A COPY

\$6.00 A YEAR

ART IN AMERICA

AN ILLUSTRATED MAGAZINE

PUBLISHED BI-MONTHLY

VOLUME VII · NUMBER III

APRIL 1919

EDITED BY

FREDERIC FAIRCHILD SHERMAN



PUBLISHED AT

SEVENTEEN-NINETY BROADWAY

NEW YORK CITY

LONDON: MESSRS. P. & D. COLNAGHI AND OBACH

144-146 NEW BOND STREET

ENTERED AS SECOND-CLASS MATTER DECEMBER 16, 1913, AT THE POST OFFICE AT NEW YORK, NEW YORK, UNDER THE ACT OF MARCH 3, 1879

DUVEEN BROTHERS

OBJETS D'ART
PAINTINGS
PORCELAINS
TAPESTRIES

NEW YORK.

PARIS.

FRENCH & Co

**ANTIQUE TAPESTRIES
FURNITURE AND TEXTILES
WORKS OF ART**

**6 EAST 56TH STREET
NEW YORK**

ESTABLISHED 1848

The F. Kleinberger
Galleries

PARIS:
9 rue de l'Echelle
Near Avenue de l'Opéra

NEW YORK:
725 Fifth Avenue
between 56th and 57th Streets

HIGH-CLASS PRIMITIVES
OF THE
ITALIAN SCHOOLS

Dutch Paintings of the 17th Century

AND

FLEMISH PRIMITIVES

in a perfect condition

ART IN AMERICA

VOLUME VII · NUMBER III · APRIL MCMXIX

CONTENTS

A MADONNA BY VAN DYCK · BY FRANK JEWETT
MATHER, JR. · PAGE 103

A RELIEF OF THE QUATTROCENTO BY THE MASTER
OF THE MARBLE MADONNAS · BY STELLA RUBIN-
STEIN · PAGE 104

COROT'S ITALIAN SHEPHERDS DANCING UNDER
TREES · BY CHARLES A. W. VOGELER · PAGE 111

GAINSBOROUGH'S PORTRAIT OF THE TOMKINSON
BOYS · BY MAURICE W. BROCKWELL · PAGE 116

AN INTERIOR BY ADRIAN VAN OSTADE · BY JOHN
SHAPLEY · PAGE 121

A FLEMISH MADONNA OF THE SIXTEENTH CEN-
TURY · BY RAYMOND WYER · PAGE 124

✓ JOHN HENRY TWACHTMAN (1853-1902) · BY ELIOT
CLARK · PAGE 129

AN EARLY AMERICAN SILVER MUG · BY HOLLIS
FRENCH · PAGE 138

The articles and pictures are copyrighted, and must not be reprinted without special permission.

PUBLISHED BY Frederic Fairchild Sherman
1790 Broadway, New York City, New York
ENGLISH AGENTS: Messrs. P. & D. Colnaghi &
Obach, 144-146 New Bond Street, London, W. 1.

Where advertisements and subscriptions will be received
and copies of the magazine may be purchased

Bankers: Bank of England, Western Branch

Barbizon House

COROT
MILLET
DAUBIGNY
DAUMIER



J. MARIS
MAT. MARIS
J. ISRAELS
MAUVE

RAEBURN GAINSBOROUGH ROMNEY

D. CROAL THOMSON

BARBIZON HOUSE, 8 HENRIETTA STREET
CAVENDISH SQUARE

LONDON, W. 1.

Telegram: OBARBIZONA - PHONE - LONDON

Telephone: MAYFAIR 1900

JOHN LEVY

HIGH CLASS PAINTINGS

14 EAST 46TH STREET

OPPOSITE THE RITZ-CARLTON

NEW YORK

BOOKS ABOUT PAINTING

Essays in the Study of Sienese Painting

By Bernard Berenson

Sm. 4to. Illustrated. \$3.50 net. Delivered, \$3.65.

Has the virtue as an expert of communicating the spirit and mood in which he works.

—*New York Times*.

Venetian Painting in America

By Bernard Berenson

Sm. 4to. Illustrated. \$5.00 net. Delivered, \$5.20 net.

One of the most significant works of reconstructive criticism that have appeared in recent years on the subject of Italian painting.—*The Dial*.

Landscape and Figure Painters of America

By Frederic F. Sherman

12mo. Illustrated. \$1.75 net. Delivered, \$1.85.

Mr. Sherman searches for spiritual and intellectual significances. He helps us to recognize beauties and apprehend sentiment.

—*Detroit Free Press*.

AMERICAN ARTISTS SERIES

Each volume uniform, finely printed from type on hand made paper in limited editions and beautifully illustrated with photogravure plates. Prices net.

ALEXANDER WYANT. By Eliot Clark.....\$12.50

WINSLOW HOMER. By Kenyon Cox..... 12.50

GEORGE INNESS. By Elliott Daingerfield... 12.50

HOMER MARTIN. By Frank J. Mather, Jr... 12.50

R. A. BLAKELOCK. By Elliott Daingerfield.. 10.00

FIFTY PAINTINGS BY INNESS..... 20.00

FIFTY-EIGHT PAINTINGS BY MARTIN..... 15.00

FREDERIC FAIRCHILD SHERMAN

1790 Broadway

New York

Scott & Fowles

Art Galleries

590 FIFTH AVENUE

NEW YORK

SATINOVER GALLERIES

*Importers of
High-Grade*

“Old Masters”

27 WEST 56TH STREET
NEW YORK

C. W. KRAUSHAAR
ART GALLERIES
260 FIFTH AVENUE NEW YORK



Paintings

Bronzes

Etchings

The Milch Galleries
DEALERS IN
AMERICAN PAINTINGS



We recommend especially the pictures of contemporary artists whose reputations have been established by the high merit of their work

Our booklet with the latest
art news of the galleries sent
on request

E. & A. MILCH, Inc.
108 WEST 57TH STREET, NEW YORK
(Next to Lotos Club)

Parish-Watson & Co., Inc.

Early Chinese Pottery

Sculptures

Old Chinese Porcelain

Rare Persian Faience

560 Fifth Avenue

Entrance through Dreicer and Co.

or by way of 46th Street

New York



VAN DYCK: MADONNA.
Collection of Mr. Henry Goldman, New York.

ART IN AMERICA · AN ILLUSTRATED MAGAZINE · VOLUME VII
NUMBER III · APRIL MCMXIX

A MADONNA BY VAN DYCK · BY FRANK JEWETT MATHER, JR.

THE exquisite little Madonna and Child which Mr. Henry Goldman has recently acquired lies in the debatable ground between Rubens and Van Dyck. When I first saw the photograph, I felt sure that one had to do with a rather early Rubens of exceptionally delicate make and feeling. Sight of the picture, with its characteristic and un-Rubenslike reds and warm brown glazes, corrected this too hasty impression. This little masterpiece can only be a Van Dyck, though it shows him in a mood of rare spontaneity. Generally speaking his religious pictures are just fair second rate, failing either through over-emphasis or sugariness. In the Goldman Madonna he has carried the note of tenderness to utmost intensity without falling into sentimentalism. There could be no better foil for the ardor of the Child than the pensiveness of the Mother.

The panel is a sketch carried pretty far, but happily arrested short of technical finish. The transparent brown background shows billowing forms which, to the detriment of the picture, might have later become foliage. The roughly scored contours show everywhere under the paint. The carnations are inwardly glowing, without the superficial pearliness proper to Rubens. The Madonna's robe is a dull Venetian pink, the scarf an iridescence of gray-green and rose, entirely in Rubens's manner. But the whole inspiration, as regards tone, is less that of the great Master of Antwerp than of Titian. Van Dyck had made good use of his eyes in Rubens's famous picture gallery.

In the Madonna we have an idealized portrait of Isabella Brant, Rubens's first wife; the Child is as unmistakably that adorable infant Nicholas Rubens. In the rendering of these exquisite infantile forms and hues Van Dyck has set himself the apparently impossible task of competing with the cherubs of Rubens—and has succeeded. Even the famous group of *Amorini* at Munich, where

Copyright, 1919, Frederic Fairchild Sherman

Rubens eternized his own children, is not lovelier than this single eager form. Nicholas, in Van Dyck's picture, seems about three years old. He was born in May, 1618. Thus Van Dyck's picture will have been painted in the early autumn of 1621, after his return from England and before his trip to Italy. He was already a master in his own right. On some visit to the mansion of his old employer, he rapidly sketched Isabella and her youngest child. About that time Rubens himself may have painted the Madonna portrait of Isabella, at Worms, in the collection of Freiherr von Heyl zu Herrnsheim. Van Dyck was a sensitive, and into this valedictory sketch, as Isabella Brant was already failing, may have crept an intimation that he was not to see her again.

The panel is twenty-five inches by nineteen inches. It is apparently No. 429 in Vol. III of Smith's "Catalogue Raisonné." Smith states that Lorenzi had engraved it. Waagen, before 1857, saw it at Harrington House, Kensington, and described it in "Galleries and Cabinets," Supplement, p. 238. It has until lately been in the possession of the Earls of Harrington, whose family tradition declared it a direct purchase from Van Dyck.

A RELIEF OF THE QUATTROCENTO BY THE MASTER OF THE MARBLE MADONNAS · BY STELLA RUBIN- STEIN

INCLUDED in the collection of Enrico Caruso is a Madonna in marble relief (Fig. 1) by the mysterious artist to whom the name of the Master of the Marble Madonnas was attached. Nothing as yet has been found enabling one to identify him—a name has not even been proposed. Is it because his work is somewhat lost among the greater and better known artists of his time? It is true that it was only lately—in the last thirty years—that some of his reliefs became gradually detached from the works of Antonio Rossellino and Mino da Fiesole, under whose names they were generally classed in museums and private collections. It is recognized, however, that the reliefs grouped under the name of the Master of the Marble Madonnas show a character which cannot be traced in any other contemporary works and which unmistakably point to an individual artist whose identity still remains unknown and probably will

remain so until some signed work bearing the characteristics of the known reliefs is discovered. Until that time we must be content with the present appellation.

The relief we are concerned with here represents the Virgin and Child crowned by two angels. The Virgin is seated, holding on her knees the Infant Jesus, who is naked except for His loins, and who has in His right hand a bird, while with His left He gives the benediction.¹ The Virgin herself is robed in a gown girdled at the waist, over which is draped a mantle. Over her hair, drawn backward in the fashion of the time, is a veil. She is sitting erect looking down at the divine Child and smiling. The Infant, too, is smiling, and so also are the two angels crowning the Virgin. Their smile is pronounced and emphasized in the most original way. As various art critics, in speaking of the sculptor, have already observed, it is this particular smile, added to the modeling of the Child's body and the Virgin's hands, that groups these works together and distinguishes them from the productions of both Rossellino and Mino da Fiesole. Most of the art critics, however, in speaking of the Master, are severe and unjust in their judgments. The first, and really the only one, who especially concerned himself with the art of that Master and with his characteristics was Bode.² In his criticism, the bad as well as the good qualities of the Master are interestingly discussed. After him, Odoardo H. Giglioli, in speaking of a marble relief in the Palazzo Comunale in Pistoja (where it was attributed to Antonio Rossellino) which he gives to the school of Mino da Fiesole (in reality it is a work by the Master of the Marble Madonnas), says that, in spite of certain defects in the workmanship, it certainly was executed by a good artist.³ Diego Angeli, in his book on Mino da Fiesole, speaks of the Master of the Marble Madonnas in very severe terms,⁴ and so does Venturi.⁵

How far is this criticism justifiable? As we know, he lived at a period when art in Italy was in one of its best phases of develop-

¹ The abnormal way of representing the Infant giving the benediction with His left hand can be traced in other works of art of the fifteenth century, such as the picture by Francesco di Giorgio in the Siena Academy (No. 288); in the Virgin and Child by Holbein the elder in Nuremberg (*Bilderschatz*, 538), etc. . . . In the case of our relief this abnormality is probably due to the requirements of the composition itself.

² The first more detailed criticism of his art was published by Bode in *Jahrbuch der Königlichen Preuss. Kunstsammlungen*, 1886: *Die Florentiner Marmorbildner der Renaissance*, p. 30, ff. He also mentions him in others of his publications, such as *Denkmäler der Renaissance Skulptur Toscanas*, p. 131; *Die Florentiner Bildhauer*, etc.

³ Odoardo H. Giglioli: *Pistoja nelle sue opere d'arte*, 1904, p. 69.

⁴ Diego Angeli: *Mino da Fiesole*, pp. 104 and 135.

⁵ Venturi: *Storia dell'arte italiana*; VI, p. 666.

ment. In the field of sculpture the names of Donatello and Verrocchio eclipsed all the other artists, and even Desiderio da Settignano, Mino da Fiesole, Rossellino and many others were not appreciated at their full value. The lack of appreciation of the Master of the Marble Madonnas is probably due to the same cause. Compared with the great masters of the fifteenth century his art seems inferior, but taken by himself and judged by the works bearing the characteristics of his art, he seems to us an artist both individual and of great value. The very defects of which he is accused bring out his individuality, as, for instance, the smile, which, according to Bode, gives to his personages an air of caricature and owing to which Venturi calls him "uno strano scalpellino," is full of life and animation. It envelops the whole face, going from the mouth to the eyes and letting the inner joy come out frankly, even if, by some, considered as exaggerated. It is this particular smile that gives so much freshness to his personages, that fills with life their attitudes and movements. Another particularity which is criticized in him is the way the bodies of the children are modeled. Diego Angeli,¹ in calling their proportions awkward, expresses the opinion of many other critics. However, if they really show some defects in their construction, on the other hand they show a treatment of the flesh full of softness, naturalness and subtle feeling. There are human qualities as well in his Madonnas as in his children and angels. The personages represented in a scene are all participating in it, animating it with their gestures and joyful expressions.

In the relief of the Caruso Collection the above-mentioned characteristics can be well observed. The Virgin, as well as the Infant and angels, seems joyful and happy. This happiness is reflected in their attitudes, gestures and expressions. The composition itself, full of dignity, recalls the compositions by Mino da Fiesole, whose Madonna types the Virgin also closely resembles. She shows the same elongated face, the same half-closed eyes, with heavy eyelids, the same high forehead, and the hair drawn backward. Her pose and the way she is draped also show striking similarities. But, while Mino represents his Virgins as very thin, with narrow and sloping shoulders, the types of our Master (and the Virgin here represented is one of them), though imitating those by Mino, are coarser, with broader shoulders and of larger proportions. The

¹ Diego Angeli: *Op. cit.*, p. 104.



Fig. 2. MASTER OF THE MARBLE MADONNAS: MARBLE RELIEF OF THE MADONNA AND CHILD.
Museo Nazionale, Florence.



Fig. 1. MASTER OF THE MARBLE MADONNAS: MARBLE RELIEF OF THE MADONNA AND CHILD.
Collection of Mr. Enrico Carruso, New York.

smile, only slightly expressed in Mino's representations, comes out frankly in the works of his follower. The modeling of the ears and of the hands also differs. On the other hand, they both work the marble in the same way, and in their technique they show the influence of Donatello, whose manner consisted in the treatment of the marble in very low relief. As for the Infant and angels, they more resemble Rossellino's productions. The treatment of their bodies, the proportions of their heads and the way they are represented show analogies with his types.

This relief comes from the Guidi Museum in Faenza.¹ It bears the arms of the Ginori family of Florence, which consist of a bend *or* charged with three eight-pointed azure stars and displayed against an azure background.² The relief also bears the mark of some guild or *confrérie*, having on the top the eight-pointed star of the Ginori family, whose members held thirty-one times the office of Prior and who for many years had a faience factory in Florence.³

This relief, which is 32 inches high and 21 inches wide, is the same as the one in the National Museum in Florence (Fig. 2). There are some insignificant variations in the composition, which can be seen in comparing the two reproductions. The relief in Florence is of larger dimensions. Though none of the writers in speaking of it give its exact dimensions, it is generally spoken of as a life-size production, which would approximately mean, counting the space occupied by the angels on top, about 50 inches. Bode speaks of it as "ein sehr grosses und besonders leeres Relief,"⁴ and he attributes the lack of feeling and the defects in the execution to its too large size.⁵

The relief in the Caruso Collection is of considerably smaller proportions, and it is probably due to this fact that it is finer in feeling and superior in execution. It is, indeed, one of the finest productions of the Master. The Virgin shows both great dignity of bearing and pose, and a fine human quality in her attitude and expression. The composition itself is well proportioned and highly decorative, and the two laughing angels crowning the Virgin, as well as the garlands

¹ *Catalogue de vente du Musée Guidi de Faenza*, 1902, pl. 36.

² There remain only traces of the original colors, blue and gold, in our relief. There are also some spots of reddish gold, but this seems to have been added later.

³ See William Chaffers: *Marks and Monograms on European and Oriental Pottery and Porcelain*, pp. 431, 434; and *ART IN AMERICA*, Vol. II, p. 245.

⁴ Bode: *Denkmäler . . . Text*, p. 131.

⁵ *Jahrbuch der Kgl. Kunsts.*, 1886, p. 31.

of leaves and fruit on either side of the composition, complete the scene admirably.

Other reliefs by the Master of the Marble Madonnas are scattered in museums and private collections. There are two in Florence,¹ three in Urbino,² one in Pistoja,³ one in Eremo at Camaldoli in Casentino,⁴ one in the collection of Sir Gambier Parry in Hingham Court,⁵ two in the Berlin Museum,⁶ two in the South Kensington Museum,⁷ two in the Louvre,⁸ one in the Corso dei Tintori in Palazzo Bombicci Pontelli,⁹ one in a collection in New York, etc.

Most of these reliefs came originally from Florence or from its vicinity, and this fact, added to the one already mentioned, that the artist worked in the manner both of Rossellino and Mino da Fiesole, shows clearly that he belongs to the Florentine School. This is also indicated by the way he handles his marble and by the decorative motifs he uses. Some of those reliefs seem directly imitated from Mino; others are nearer Rossellino's art, and still others can be traced to the influence of Donatello. All, however, bear the mark and characteristics of the same workmanship—the workmanship of the artist temporarily known as the Master of the Marble Madonnas.

¹ Both reproduced in Venturi: *Storia dell'arte italiana*, VI, pp. 669, 670.

² One of them reproduced in Lipparini: *Urbino*, p. 97.

³ Reproduced in Giglioli: *Pistoja nelle sue opere d'arte*, p. 70.

⁴ Bode: *Denkmäler* . . . , pl. 423.

⁵ Bode: *Denkmäler* . . . , pl. 424.

⁶ Bode: *Denkmäler* . . . , pl. 423-424.

⁷ Diego Angeli: *Mino da Fiesole*, pp. 104, 106.

⁸ Mentioned by Bode in *Jahrbuch der Kgl. Kunsts.*, 1886, p. 32.

⁹ Mentioned in *Catalogo del Museo Nazionale*, p. 420.

COROT'S ITALIAN SHEPHERDS DANCING UNDER TREES • BY CHARLES A. W. VOGELER

ABOUT 1860-65, Corot executed his painting, *Italian Shepherds Dancing under Trees* (Fig. 1), the landscape composition of which lends itself so peculiarly to his manner. The foreground is indicated as it might appear at a distance. The limb at the very front is almost vague in its quietness. Beyond, in the line of trees which crosses the picture, an approach to actual representation is made. These trees are remarkable both for realism and for convention in the frame-like use made of them, more particularly in connection with two dancing figures and a landscape view. The dancing figures, a shepherd and a shepherdess in the costume of Italian peasants, are so shaded by the trees that their graceful forms stand out almost after the manner of a silhouette against the curtain of light which covers the background. Behind the singular arch of trees, near the center, is a wooded hill, crowned by a tower-like building, somewhat resembling the Castel Gandolfo, with terraced architecture descending to water, at the right. Here the view is bounded only by one of Corot's limitless skies.

A prototype of the landscape composition in the picture is to be found in a study which Corot made at the beginning of his artistic career, in 1826-28, while he was in Italy for the first time, that is to say, some thirty-five years previous to the date attributed to our painting. The subject then was a view of the Coliseum from the Farnese Gardens (Fig. 2). In the *Italian Shepherds Dancing under Trees* the following changes have been made in the arrangement: the composition has been reversed; a natural Italian landscape has been inserted in place of the Coliseum and other buildings for a background; the view to the right is free instead of being shut in at the end by a tree; four figures have been introduced (two shepherdesses are under a tree to the right); a fallen limb has been added in the foreground. It would seem that Corot had the early work in his studio when he painted our picture; at any rate, it was among his effects later on.

The Farnese Gardens, situated in Rome south of the Forum, on the Palatine Hill, were laid out under Pope Paul III Farnese (1534-1550). Napoleon III purchased the Gardens in 1861, which is about the date of our painting, and they remained in French possession

until 1870, when they were bought by the Italian Government. Then, as now, their chief distinction, apart from the significance of the residence of the Caesars, was the singular beauty of the spot. Corot evidently was impressed by it.

The impression made upon Corot appears never to have left him. A chapter could be written on the affectionate regard he had for the scene to the end of his life, as is shown in his later works, not a few of which repeat the singular archway of trees or some other portion of it. Some of his more important works do this; for example, as Robaut has discovered, the well-known *Dance of the Nymphs*, of which the Louvre possesses two versions. But it would be difficult to find a more striking reminiscence than in the landscape composition of the painting owned by Mr. W. K. Bixby.

The Louvre possesses a companion picture known as *Italian Shepherds Dancing to the Music of a Mandolin*. The two compositions vary only in minor respects.

The expression, "classical landscape," for such pictures by Corot, is ambiguous, since it might be used with reference either to the subject or to the interpretation. It is of course largely a matter of conjecture to what extent the form of Corot was influenced by the classical landscape in which he lived during some of his most impressionable years, and it is not to be forgotten that the artistic soil of France to which Corot subsequently returned had been fertilized with classic cultures. But as the artists of Greece were almost certainly influenced by the actual form of the country in Greece, Corot painted again and again the beauty of Italy which he had seen, and where he had found an artistic freedom which was entirely foreign to the academic classicism of his predecessors. They conserved only the body of classicism, not its live spirit. He, Corot, could so blend matter and form, convention and innovation, that he was a true child of the classic movement. His landscapes breathed that quiet, formal and truthful beauty which is Latin or Greek in its naturalism no less than in its convention.

Corot from the first was true to his Latin nature. So early as 1825 or 1826, in a drawing made of the city of Rome, the city is not obtrusive, not catalogued. On the contrary, graceful design, sky, air, and light, in the open country, characterize the drawing. The foreground is hardly more than a suggestion of air, indicated by waves of delicately pencilled lines. The representation effectually



Fig. 1. COROT: ITALIAN SHEPHERDS DANCING IN THE SHADE OF TREES.
Collection of Mr. W. K. Birby, St. Louis, Mo.



Fig. 2. COROT: VIEW OF THE COLISEUM FROM THE FARNESE GARDENS.

begins in the distance. There the city, foreshortened, spreads itself ribbonlike across the picture, not severely, but delicately. The Castel Sant' Angelo is its most conspicuous detail, but that is suggestively handled, though crisp in its outline as an etching. Behind the city the Campagna resumes its hardly interrupted way. Here, already, the delicate sky gives infinite space. So, almost from the start, one may say, Corot felt the need of atmospheric envelopment.

Turner had evolved a similar method some seven years earlier, as is shown in a drawing made by him at Tivoli in 1819, the view in his case being taken from the summit of Monte Catillo.

Beginning in the first quarter of the nineteenth century, the English and the French master were to speak, as had Van Goyen in the seventeenth century, increasingly in terms of light and air. The thoroughness with which Corot follows up the start made early in Italy, until he becomes one of the great masters of atmospheric light, is apparent from our painting, where every bit of substance has been brought into harmonious relation. Feeling and form so fine is demonstrable in the landscapes of few of his contemporaries. The effect is more frequent in the landscape painting—much older—of China.

Corot departed relatively earlier than Turner in his career, from a classical formula, which relegated the landscape to a lesser rôle compared with the figure. How far he departed may be seen in our painting, where the figures play a prominent, yet nowise an obtrusive, part; receiving no more consideration from Corot than trees, sky, or light. A great change has in fact been accomplished from the time when Hellenistic artists would personify a stream or a tree by the figure of a man or woman. The revolution has been almost completed by Corot. The ancient anthropomorphism is giving way to an interest in the boundless versatility of nature. Neither Hubert Robert nor Vernet went as far, because the old tradition, perhaps the religious conviction, was too strong then to be overlooked; and absolute emancipation of the landscape was not accomplished until the nineteenth century.

The depth and versatility of Corot are remarkably apparent in Mr. Bixby's picture, displaying effects at once so modern and so classic that, while reminiscent of the landscape manner of Poussin and of Claude Lorrain, they are anticipatory of the graceful manner for which Degas, in turn, is indebted to Corot.

GAINSBOROUGH'S PORTRAIT OF THE TOMKINSON BOYS • BY MAURICE W. BROCKWELL

IT is remarkable how sensational were some of the incidents in the closing years of Gainsborough and how the interest evoked by the portraits he painted at the very end of his career not only still subsists but is ever on the increase. That his "feathery" manner characterizes his later works is fully admitted. We recall the words of Sir Joshua Reynolds in the discourse that he delivered late in 1788, when the world had "lately lost Mr. Gainsborough." "All those odd scratches and marks observable in his pictures," the President said, "by a kind of magic, at a certain distance, assume form and all the parts seem to drop into their proper places." This remark applies admirably to the "Masters Tomkinson," in the collection of Mr. and Mrs. Charles P. Taft at Cincinnati, that we now reproduce.

However opinions may vary to-day as to the usefulness of the Royal Academy, its foundation in the third quarter of the eighteenth century was inevitable. The Academy's "Instrument," by which it was established as a society "for promoting the arts of design," has from the outset met with criticism; it has even been dubbed "the most unconstitutional parchment in existence." Gainsborough's attitude was at times antagonistic, and generations of critics have claimed that the chief object of the originators of the Academy was "not to promote the arts of design but to promote themselves." But from the time that its members began in 1870 to organize loan exhibitions of paintings by the Old Masters it has been increasingly evident that they have thereby contributed vastly to the world's knowledge and appreciation of the history of painting. Not, of course, that exact scholarship and penetrating research have always characterized the official catalogues of such exhibitions. Indeed, the present picture suffices to show the justice of this contention. For when our portrait group was lent to the Exhibition of 1889, it was an entirely unknown work, not having been previously exhibited, engraved or even cited by any art-writer. It was then catalogued (No. 142) as "Henry and Edward Tomkinson, sons of James Tomkinson, of Bostock." As we now realize, no credence is to be placed in such an identification. The Academy's Cataloguer confused the Edward Tomkinson in our picture—he was born in



GAINSBOROUGH: THE TOMKINSON BOYS.
Collection of Mr. and Mrs. Charles P. Taft, Cincinnati, Ohio.

1773—with his father, also Edward, born in 1743. He also wrongly described the other boy, actually William, as Henry, who had been born as early as 1741. A mere error in nomenclature would perhaps be due to the carelessness or the lack of knowledge of one or other of the descendants who provided the information at the time of the exhibition. Such error would be pardonable if it did not conflict with the stylistic considerations of the work in question. But a momentary glance at the canvas would have revealed that it was painted at the very end of the artist's career, and not *circa* 1753. To tally with the statement in the catalogue and the obvious childhood of the boys represented, it would have had to come from the hand of Gainsborough thirty-five years before he died. In point of fact, it was undertaken and achieved only four years before his end came.

On the occasion of the exhibition held in the early months of 1889, the picture drew forth encomiums in the press. The *London Times* described it as "indeed a charming work, and Gainsborough seldom painted a more delightful picture than that of the elder boy [in point of fact, he was the younger] in his blue coat, standing facing the spectator with his hat in his hand. In all the familiar qualities of Gainsborough's art this picture stands out as one of very great interest, the colour is delightful and the landscape exquisite."

Long after that exhibition our portrait group passed to Mr. Ludwig Neumann in London. Still later it was shown at the exhibition held at the galleries of Messrs Agnew in November, 1906. Again it was acclaimed, and before long it was added to the collection of Mr. and Mrs. Charles P. Taft.

Research shows that the boy with dark hair, wearing a red tail-coat and seated on the bank, is William Tomkinson, afterwards Wettenhall, of Hankelow. He was born at Manchester, October 19, 1772. His father, Edward, by devise of the will of Nathaniel Wettenhall, assumed the name of Wettenhall in 1798, together with the arms: *Vert, a cross engrailed Ermine*. The grandfather of William Tomkinson, or Wettenhall, was James Tomkinson, an eminent attorney who by his extensive practice and parsimonious habits had managed to purchase the Dorfold estates. Although he was rich, it might be said of him that *crescit amor nummi quantum ipsa pecunia crescit*. James Hall in his "History of Nantwich" tells

many stories of James Tomkinson's hoarding propensities, and several seem to have survived locally until a generation ago.

The boy standing in the center of the composition, and a little further back, is Edward, who has long fair hair and blue eyes and wears a dark blue swallow-tail coat with a red collar. He was born in January and baptized March 8, 1773, dying unmarried in 1819. It seems that from him the picture descended. It, doubtless, was inherited by his brother, the Rev. James Tomkinson, of Dorfold Hall. He had a son, who died unmarried, and two daughters; the elder of these, Anne, married Wilbraham Spencer Tollemache, younger brother of the first Lord Tollemache. This lady left issue, Henry James Tollemache, formerly Member of Parliament for West Cheshire, who lent this picture to the Academy in 1889, as we have seen, and subsequently sold it.

It is a matter of common knowledge that Gainsborough withdrew his intended contributions to the Academy of 1784, on account of a difference he had with the Council, who would not hang one of his works in a particular light, although he had left to their discretion the placing of all his other pictures. Although no contemporary journal gives a complete list of the pictures that Gainsborough intended to send in, in the spring of 1784, we know, from a sheet of paper yellowed with age and still in the possession of the Academy, the titles of eight of them. Mr. Whitley, the master's latest and in some ways most informing biographer, tells us that at the top of this sheet of paper is written in the painter's handwriting: "Portraits by T. Gainsborough; the frames sent." Then follow, in the order named, rough, pen and ink sketches of the portraits of the three eldest Princesses, Lady Buckinghamshire, Lord Buckinghamshire, Lord Rodney, Lord Rawdon, "two boys with a dog—Master Tomkinsons," and Lord Hood. The sketches of the Buckinghamshires, Rodney, Rawdon and the Tomkinson Boys are ticked at the side in red, and in the same ink "come" is written on the sheet to indicate, as Mr. Whitley claims, that these particular works or their frames had been received at the Academy. In this regard we may point out that in the canvas now at Cincinnati there is no dog. We recall also that Gainsborough had exhibited in 1783 (No. 35) a painting of "Two Shepherd's Boys, with dogs fighting." The late Sir Walter Armstrong in his excellent monograph compresses that title into "Two Boys with a dog," and for some reason that is not

clear states that the picture exhibited in 1783 portrays the "Masters Tomkinson," which he appears to identify with the canvas of the Taft collection. Yet such is not the fact.

The magnificently painted and wonderfully preserved work before us belongs to the same period as the large Baillie Family, now in the National Gallery, and the superb Count Rumford which, under the title of "Gainsborough's American Sitter" was published in *ART IN AMERICA* in December, 1917. It antedates the world-famous Market Cart of 1786 now in the National Gallery. We may recall that in 1786 Gainsborough was "engaged upon a beautiful landscape, in the foreground of which are introduced the trio of pigs that are so highly celebrated by the Connoisseurs, together with the little girl and several rustic figures." We read that that picture was bought a few weeks later by "Mr. Tollemache" who has not, we believe, been identified. But we have noted that a descendant of the fair boy Edward on our canvas married a Tollemache.

Such, very briefly, are the facts, and the correct identification of the Tomkinson Boys, whose surname has often been misspelt. Ormerod in his "History of the County Palatine and City of Chester" gives much genealogical data regarding the Tomkinsons, as well as of the Wettenhalls, whose name is known to us in the personality of John de Wetenhale as far back as 43 Henry III. Dugdale's "Visitation" of 1663, collated with Somerford MSS. revised from Plea Rolls, and other evidences also add to our knowledge of the family history.

It will not be gainsaid that Gainsborough has here produced a masterpiece, both in technical accomplishment and in striking characterization of two lads who are not only sympathetic but each of whom is in his twelfth year.

AN INTERIOR BY ADRIAN VAN OSTADE • BY JOHN SHAPLEY

IN view of the insuperable mass of notices of Adrian van Ostade, to say that the lovely example here discussed has never before been published is unsafe, yet very likely true. Its history prior to entrance into the Harris collection is unknown. But since that time, whether in the house of the collector or, as now, in the museum

of Brown University,¹ it has unfortunately missed the attention it deserves.

The painting (page 127), which is done on a small panel twelve inches high by nine inches wide, is in a good state of preservation and is signed "A Ostade 1651." The subject is a dark interior with three figures, a man and two women. Grouped about a barrel on which a heavy board serves as a table, their action expresses a phase of peasant life which Ostade was particularly fond of representing, the quiet social enjoyment of the pipe and the jug.

The young man, smiling broadly, stands at the left holding a jug behind him in his right hand and raising a flask in the other. Behind him on a bench are his pipe, tobacco and bowl of coals. He is dressed in picturesque costume. His coat, gathered in by a belt at the waist and falling in soft folds half way to his knees, is of a yellowish brown color, as are also his leggings. His trousers and cap are a deep brown, and the latter is given a nonchalant effect by the angle at which it is worn and the feather that decks it. A sheathed knife hanging from his belt completes his gay appearance.

The young woman stands at the opposite side of the table. She holds a knife in one hand and in the other an indistinct object; the leaves, some of which have fallen on table and floor, indicate fruit or vegetable which she is preparing. Her face is more refined and pleasing than that of either of the other figures, though it is no more interesting. Her costume is that of a housewife. Its colors give the brightest notes to the picture. The waist is red, the skirt green and the apron and cap white, all moderated by neutralizing tones.

The costume of the old woman, with the exception of her white cap or bonnet, is so much in the shadow as to be almost wholly indistinguishable. Nor is her action, as she leans over the table at the back of the group, at all clear—the simple process of filling a pipe seems the most plausible interpretation. She, like the man, has a broad, rather uncouth smile on her face.

All eyes are for the moment intent upon the object that the young woman holds in her left hand. This concentration of attention is the most decisive motive in binding together the composition, though, indeed, it is not otherwise lacking in unity and harmony.

¹ George Washington Harris bequest.

Color was not Ostade's forte. But he was never dissonant. Looking at the chaste harmonies of reds and browns, one wonders why the Dutchman's characters are not so becoming as the tones in which they are rendered. A deep golden brown, characteristic of his work after his contact with Rembrandt, pervades the picture. It runs through the more positive colors in the masses of the costumes, saturates the dark shadows in the background, and glows with greatest intensity in the light on the faces.

At the side of the room a door standing ajar gives a glimpse of a still darker interior beyond, enhancing by contrast the light of the room where the scene is laid. All the light in the picture comes from the front, falling first upon the figures, then penetrating with increasing dimness into the farther recesses of the room.

The kindness of the artist in setting down the date, a by no means exceptional benevolence to posterity practised by painters of the time, makes it of interest to look into the similarity observable between this picture and its brothers and sisters nearest it in point of time, though Ostade's general sameness of technique and subject matter, together with his practice of adding the finishing touches and the signature and date after pictures had been for years in his studio,¹ results often in as great similarity between pictures widely separated in date as between those of the same year.

The Fiddler in the Hermitage, painted in 1648, is, both in facial type and in costume, even to the feather in his hat and ruff about his neck, a fair parallel for the young man in our picture.

To some of the female members of the Louvre family portrait, now generally accepted as a genuine Ostade and assigned to 1650-60, the young woman in our painting bears such striking resemblance as to suggest that her model came from this family. The type of face and shape of head are the same, and the similar style of head-dress makes the resemblance the more insistent.

The old woman of our picture is a type frequently used by the artist, not only for women, but also for men, particularly in his earlier paintings. The two old women and some of the men in the painting called Old Fiddler (dated 1641) in the Metropolitan Museum show close similarity with this one in form and expression of face. The coloring also of the two pictures is similar.

¹ *Niederländisches Künstler-Lexikon*, s.v.

But the small panel of *A Smoker*, also in the Metropolitan Museum, offers in some points a closer parallel.

Ostade's output was so large and the practice of employing assistants then so common that any contention that this little interior is wholly by his hand would be unwise. The careless drawing of the hands and the obscure motives of some of the actions seems, indeed, to favor the idea of a collaborator; for in some—though not all—of Ostade's works all such details are carefully drawn. (Among the exceptions are some of the hands in the *Old Fiddler* referred to above.) The conception of the design, however, and the principal features of the picture can have as their source no other artist than the master whose signature the painting bears.

A FLEMISH MADONNA OF THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY · BY RAYMOND WYER

ONLY of comparatively recent date has the collector on this side of the Atlantic given serious attention to primitive art.

Hitherto art of this period has blossomed more or less unobserved in the various museums of the country, and the awakened interest, following the example of Europe, has been largely confined to examples of Italian art, more especially those belonging to the sixteenth century. The Flemish and Dutch primitives were necessarily overshadowed by the Italians, whose art evidenced a much purer strain; but, none the less, it is the presence of alien qualities that has given Flemish art a distinct charm and made it an object of latter-day devotion.

Reverting to the early fifteenth century, Flemish art will be found technically, as well as in some other aspects, superior to Italian art. In spite of the fact that Flanders was not endowed with the advantages which enabled Italy to rise to such interpretative heights, an important influence is observable in the development of Italian painting. Indeed, the art of Flanders gave it considerable impetus, and without serious fear of contradiction, it can be postulated that the fine qualities initiated by the Van Eycks—leading to Van der Weyden, culminating gloriously in Memling—had more to do with the art of Italy than of Flanders in the sixteenth century. They and their intermediaries were true to themselves and to their racial spirit. But, at the culmination of the fifteenth century a change of faith and

ideals began to take place—a condition that persisted with greater force toward the end of the sixteenth century. Although this faltering confidence in Flemish tradition in seeking after new inspiration casts a shadow over much of the art of this period, there are in the domain of portraiture and sacred subjects many remarkable paintings to its credit wherein the cult of and veneration for Italian art has not indiscreetly obtruded.

The æsthetic study of Flemish art demands that each picture be judged on its individual merits, for it is astonishing that what appears in one example a hopeless combination of influences may in another, even with the same admixture, have much to delight one. In some cases there is a distinct fusion of the spirit of both nations; in others we are confronted with an impossible affectation—yet there is often a *naïveté* in the attempt to add foreign refinement that is irresistible. Flemish art rarely possesses the pure style which typifies Italian art. A prolonged high civilization with tradition and native qualities contributed a graceful dignity to art in Italy that remains unsurpassed and rarely approached.

Although Flemish art of this period could not attain to these heights, at its best and even when not quite at its best, it combined a natural vigor with other attractive qualities. Inferior examples, indeed, were often preferable to much reactionary performance, notwithstanding the fact that they were governed by two contradictory influences, unsubjected to reconciliation. Such art was virile in contradistinction to the decadent output of Italy at the close of the sixteenth century, for the Carracci and their followers had no alien strength with which to invigorate the diluted Italian spirit. Neither did this Flemish art possess the cold formality of the French David, nor the triviality that attached itself to English art of the middle nineteenth century. It is better to be vulgar than merely placid, and, indeed, there are greater possibilities in vulgarity than in resurrected classicism or unsophisticated mediocrity. Often, therefore, the chief fault of sixteenth century art lies in its unassimilated but sometimes not unpleasantly incorporated foreign attributes.

The painting (page 127) is of particular interest, possessing much of the merit and demerit of sixteenth century Flemish art. But many of its faults, as well as the æsthetic qualities, are of a nature conducive to the charm of the *ensemble*. In seeking for an attribution, not by any means an easy matter concerning a work of this

period and character, one thinks of Jan Gossaert, inasmuch as it most resembles certain works accepted as correctly attributed to this painter.

Gossaert was born at Maubeuge, a small town in Hainault, in 1472, and died about the year 1535. He is more generally known as Mabuse, after his birthplace. Mabuse was one of the first to be influenced by Italian art. In company with Van Orley he went to Italy, and on his return showed devotion to Milanese traditions and methods, freely using Renaissance architectural backgrounds, which gave to many of his pictures an appearance of heaviness and pretentiousness. Mabuse painted excellent portraits, and a number of his small religious groups are exceedingly fine. His design is generally good, his coloring fresh, accompanied by a remarkable finish, and in spite of his preoccupation with Italian ideas, the Flemish spirit always remains.

An atmospheric fusion of tones, more peculiar to art of a later date, characterizes the painting of the face of the Virgin. The filmy veil on the head, gracefully falling to the shoulder, adds to the charm of the fresh and delicately blended color of the face. In design, Mabuse possesses something in common with Albrecht Dürer, and a stylistic resemblance to Gérard David. These qualities are apparent to some extent in this picture. Although one misses the grave serenity that pervades so many of the faces in David's pictures, one cannot fail to observe a similarity in the atmospheric delicacy in this painting. The refinement of the Madonna's face is perhaps intensified by her knitted brow and brooding expression.

Since the beginnings of Flemish art, interest has been manifested in portraiture, and in most religious compositions we notice a portrait-like character given to each figure. The face of Joseph here is typical in this respect and he and the Madonna are playing a part in human affairs of which they are seriously conscious. The trifling realism—symbolic perhaps of the human race—in the obstreperous Child and His indifference to the seriousness of life, somewhat emphasizes the concern of Mary and Joseph. The troubled expression on the Virgin's countenance is not the result of definite knowledge of a calamity; rather with mystic penetration does she look into the future, and with woman's instinct is conscious of impending trouble, not only to the Infant but to all humanity. Joseph's face is as rich in its brown swarthy tones as the Virgin's—infused with



ADRIAN VAN OSTAED: AN INTERIOR.
George Washington Harris Bequest, Brown University, Providence, R. I.



JAN MABUSE: VIRGIN AND CHILD.
Collection of Mr. Frank C. Smith, Jr., Worcester, Mass.

color, soft and cool. He is looking with keen interest and considerable anxiety at the Virgin, and the dramatic expressions on the two faces appear to be more than accidental.

Studying the design, one feels an absence of rhythmic unity in the relation of Joseph's figure to the rest of the composition. It is lacking in proportion and has somewhat the appearance of being inserted as an afterthought. The head, however, is a splendid piece of painting, and in regard to the faulty design, it may be said that therein lies a certain charm. The mantle of the Virgin is red and covers a brown robe trimmed with fur of the same color. The angels, some playing musical instruments, give interest and life to the very dark background, but all in a minor key, so that there is no conflict with the main parts of the picture, where the color is restrained and quietly distinguished. Indeed, restraint is a very insistent note throughout the painting and it is from this quality that the panel derives much of its fascination.

JOHN HENRY TWACHTMAN (1853-1902) • BY ELIOT CLARK

THE great contrast between the early work of John Twachtman and his later and mature work can only be explained by studying the larger art movement with which his work is associated. It is, in brief, the contrast between the Munich school of the seventies and the Parisian school of impressionism of the nineties, a contrast between the dark, colorless, but strongly painted canvases which reflect the sombreness of the North, and the light, airy and vibrant canvases which one associates with sunshine and the South.

Although we can thus simply and briefly classify the work of Twachtman, it is at once apparent in his earliest canvases that he was gifted with an instinctive artistic sensibility and a very personal appreciation and interpretation. This is observed not only in his brushwork, but in his singleness of vision and purpose, which is undoubtedly the origin of good brushwork. There is a directness, a spontaneity, a freedom of touch and a certain command and authority in the early painting of Twachtman, which, if it does not indicate the future way of the painter, indicates at once that he is a painter. It is not merely the result of clever and superficial brushing, it is not merely a mannerism, but it implies a clearness of vision, a compre-

hension of things seen, and an instinctive ability in reducing them to simple and expressive pictorial forms.

The first manner culminates in the early eighties. It is noticeable that some of the best canvases of this period are subjects of harbors and shipping, subjects to which he returned in later life at Gloucester. We recall a picture dated "N. Y. '79" in which fishing boats, with sails furled, are lying at the docks, the upright repetition of the masts contrasted by angular wooden houses in the background. In technique it is a veritable "tour de force." The painter never realized his subject with greater command of brush. The arrangement, which does not suggest deliberate composing, is nevertheless nicely calculated, and characterizes the subject with picturesque and striking effect. When we reflect that at this time Manet was startling his Parisian audience by his frank realization of the intimate life about him, we must recognize that the realism of Twachtman must have appeared most blatant to the blinking eyes of his American contemporaries.

In the early work, however, the element of light and color is lacking, the value contrasts are forced, and if within given limitations it is consistent, we shall see that it was not fully satisfying to the later painter of light. The French landscapes show a deliberate change. The Munich manner of painting is abandoned. Instead of the full unctuous quality of pigment and strong contrasts of light and dark, we now see a very thin application of paint, a delicate and sensitive touch and a closer consideration of values. The canvas is of fine French linen; the painting hardly more than a wash; the color is almost in monotone, with variations of silvery grays and greens; the composition is less crowded and the spacing of simple forms is made significant. We may trace this tendency to the growing interest in Whistler and the Japanese, but the appreciation of line and rhythm is purely personal. The form is rendered in simple flat contour; the composition is long; the first plane is in the immediate foreground and the perspective is limited. This is noteworthy, for it indicates the designer and shows his growing interest in pattern.

The intermediate manner was significant. It revealed the painter to himself. He saw his nature manifested in delicacy rather than strength, in the sensitive rather than the striking, in the subtle rather than the obvious. Had he continued in the Munich manner he might later have found himself, like Duveneck, artistically

stranded. But Twachtman was of a very sensitive and receptive nature, keenly conscious of his environment, reflecting the quickened aspirations of his generation. The world in which he lived was his subject, his impressions of it his expression. He had not a romantic reverence for nature. The subjects which had inspired his predecessors were to him merely sentimental. The awe-inspiring grandeur of primitive nature was to him of little significance; scenic splendor and the sublimity of vastness and expanse awakened no responsive chord; he never sought to realize the illimitable or suggest in paint the fascination of fairy-like palpitating perspective. On the contrary, his viewpoint is seldom in the distance; he designs with known quantities against simply related planes, and he seems instinctively to see in nature its pictorial value in terms of color and form rather than the associative idea. When he painted the Yellowstone Falls he was not properly impressed by its height, he saw only the beauty of line and color; he seemed to be entirely unimpressed by the natural marvels of the Park but recorded the opalescent colors of its pools. Before Niagara Falls he is not inspired by awe and reverence, but sees an opportunity for an artistic arrangement. This gives to his pictures a singleness of intention unclouded by indefinable emotions. It also establishes his limitations, but he knowingly works within limitations. His Niagara is a pleasing pattern, a bouquet of color, but one is not impressed, as he was not impressed, by the force and volume and immensity of this marvelous exposition of nature's power.

If Twachtman was not poetical in the literary sense, a form of expression which requires the associative and intellectual idea, he was truly poetical in the æsthetic sense, a sense which is more elusive possibly because less used, and a sense which finds its poetical expression in painting not so much in a merely graphic way, but in the more abstract expression of form and color which is a language quite unique and independent of the thoughts formed by words. His work is therefore not without idea, but it is an æsthetic rather than a literary idea.

The æsthetic idea in painting is not, however, created out of nothing. Its beginning and evolution, like every other form of expression, is from the human emotion, and Twachtman was essentially human. His nature was comparatively little uncorrupted by superficial conventionalities. He was impressed by the outer world

at first hand, so to speak. His pictures have a very intimate appeal, because the subject appealed to him very intimately. He does not merely describe his subjects in paint, as illustration his work has little value, but he puts into his design something of his spiritual impression of the subject. His picture is not in consequence simply a visual impression, it is more properly a poetical impression. Twachtman showed very clearly, in his early work, that he had the ability to represent a given subject in a graphic manner, but he sacrificed this more popular aspect of painting in seeking to express its most abstract and significant aspect.

This evolution of the æsthetic idea is interestingly illustrated in a series of waterfalls which Twachtman painted near his home at Cos Cob. The first studies are the most naturalistic, studies of a particular waterfall having the ordinary aspect of the ordinary waterfall. Later the forms are enlarged and simplified, the angle of vision is reduced, a single aspect is pictured and the action of the water is given, not by a faithful and naturalistic rendering of the surface qualities of water, but by selecting the most expressive forms and so arranging the design that these forms are an integral and structural part of the composition. The waterfall in the nearby woods thus becomes æsthetically as important as the overwhelming immensity of Niagara. It is herein that Twachtman was a creative composer. He did not take a ready-made pattern and impose it on his subject or translate his subject into a preconceived formula. Even such a distinguished designer as Whistler often adapted a Japanese design to a subject with which it had no inner relation. It is thus that design is debased, and becomes merely ornamental. With Twachtman the distinction is important, because it explains not only the value of his finest achievements, but also explains his less successful ventures, wherein, failing to fulfil his intention, there is little of the purely ornamental or realistic to entertain the spectator.

Twachtman's color is always related to values. Inasmuch as he worked within a limited range of values, he likewise worked within a limited range of color. He enjoyed painting snow because he was interested in the variation of hues within closely related values, and saw the rhythmic lines of nature brought out in the contour of a hill, the outcropping of a stone wall or the ice-bound brook. In fact, his delight in the study of light on white led him at times to paint almost entirely without contrasts, and the landscape merges into



JOHN H. TWACHTMAN: FEBRUARY.
Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, Mass.



JOHN H. TWACHTMAN: THE END OF WINTER.
Evans Collection, National Gallery of Art, Washington, D. C.



JOHN H. TWACHTMAN: THE WATERFALL.
Hearn Collection, Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York.



JOHN H. TWACHTMAN: GLOUCESTER.

the indefinable forms of atmosphere. His method of painting was a direct outcome of his æsthetic idea. As he pictured the more elusive and subtle effects of nature, so too his technique is illusive and subtle. His painting is not blatant or obvious. He seems to lend to his treatment something of the spirit of the thing itself. The snow is heavy, though soft, and the texture of the pigment indicates its surface; the flowing water is painted with a rapid and expressive brush; the painted flowers of the field seem imbued with the delicacy of their own nature. When Emil Carlsen told Twachtman that he was a great technician, Twachtman said: "Technique, I don't know anything about it." It is often true that one becomes utterly unconscious of that about which one knows most, and to become entirely unconscious of technique is certainly to have mastered it.

Twachtman worked at a time when a new point of view was most welcome and refreshing, when a new conception had something of the exhilaration of a discovery, when the studio trappings needed dusting in the open air. He was one of the first of our landscape painters to use the square canvas, and the resulting innovation in design, and the new possibilities of spacing within an untried proportion was conducive to many interesting results. The high skyline was another innovation which brought with it many changes in areas, and at once indicated a more intimate interest in nearby subjects; while to completely eliminate the sky was, to the older school, to eliminate landscape. But to-day, when these changes have become more or less formalized, the aspect of novelty can no longer appeal. If Twachtman is to hold a permanent place in painting, it will be due to the permanent and universal quality of his painting and not because of its novelty. This permanent quality is to be measured not only by that nature which we associate with visual truth, but by that human nature by means of which it is interpreted. It is because the pictures of John Twachtman are imbued with something of the mystery that is called life, as manifested in form and color, that they have that permanent quality.

AN EARLY AMERICAN SILVER MUG • BY HOLLIS FRENCH

TANKARDS and cans, while comparatively difficult to find, are plentiful when contrasted with genuine mugs. In consequence it is of real interest to collectors and connoisseurs to chronicle the discovery of a piece of this type by John Edwards' hand which has recently been secured by Philip L. Spalding, Esq., of Boston.

In the great collection of early American silver shown at the Boston Museum of Fine Arts in 1911, when over one thousand pieces were displayed, only eight mugs were shown, and of these none is comparable in beauty of line with the piece recently discovered.

It seems strange that a drinking vessel so similar to the tankard should not have been more frequently made, but such appears to be the fact, and this circumstance makes collectors all the more anxious to obtain vessels of this description.

Technically, as defined by the Walpole Society, whose classification of American silver has become standard, a mug is "a silver drinking vessel with straight or tapering sides, scroll handle, flat bottom, moulded base and no lid." This piece is frequently confused with the more ordinarily found can, which differs from it by having a curved body, rounded bottom and splayed base.

The Edwards piece, which is shown in the accompanying illustration, is $4\frac{1}{4}$ inches high with a diameter at the lip of $3\frac{1}{2}$ inches, and is perhaps the finest of its type yet discovered. Attention is particularly called to the beauty of its mouldings. While the lip is not substantially different from others of its class previously found, the base is particularly rich in its lines, and this in turn is outdone by the beauty of the midband, whose mouldings are unsurpassed even by well-known tankards. The handle is of the simple S type and the mask on the tip is moulded in imitation of a cherub's face. The proportions and detail of the whole piece are truly most satisfying to the eye, and the patina of the surface, which is only suggested in the illustration, is equal to all that the most critical could desire.

Like the majority of early American pieces, it has passed from the hands of its early owners, and little or nothing can be told of its history, which, if known, would undoubtedly be most interesting. On the handle appears the name of S. Russell, probably the original owner and perhaps the same one who owned a Coney mug. If so,



JOHN EDWARDS: COLONIAL SILVER MUG.
Collection of Mr. Philip L. Spalding, Boston.

he was referred to by Mr. F. H. Bigelow in his work on early silver as one who gave a tankard to the church in Marblehead in 1725.

The maker's mark, shown in the illustration, proclaims it to be by one of our earliest silversmiths, John Edwards, who was born in 1670 in Limehouse, England, now a part of London. About 1688 he came with his father to Boston, where at one time he had a place on Dock Square.

A genealogical record may be dry to the uninitiated, but to the student of early Colonial history it is most illuminating, and to the silver collector it is of great importance, which must be the excuse for referring to it here at some length. John's first wife, to whom he was married in 1694 in Boston, was Sybil Newman, a granddaughter of the second John Endicott and a step-daughter of Zerubabel, Governor Endicott's son. To the Endicott family he was further allied by the marriage of his sister Anna to the Governor's grandson, and in recognition of this close connection he was granted by the Boston Selectmen in 1722 the "Liberty to Improve" the Endicott tomb in the Granary burying ground "until a person of Better Right to it appears to claim it." One cannot help wondering what would have happened if such a person had appeared to insist on his right after John had "Improved" the tomb by occupying it.

As divorces were not as common in those days as they are now, we may assume that John's first wife died previous to 1740, for in that year he married Abigail Fowle, then widow of William Smith of Charlestown.

As his first wife was the daughter of a clergyman, and his stepson by the second wife became one, John must have been quite closely connected with the church, which relation was further accentuated by the fact that his son Samuel married the daughter of his second wife.

This son Samuel, who was born in 1705 and died in 1762, followed his father's trade and became a silversmith, whose pieces show great ability and are much sought after by collectors.

As in olden times the trade of the father was frequently followed by several descendants, so another and older son, Thomas Edwards, 1701-1755, and a grandson, Joseph, Jr., 1737-1783, were both silversmiths, the latter being a son of John's son Joseph, 1707-1777, who, though first thought to have been of the same occupation, had, it now appears, forsworn the trade to become a stationer.

The elder John must have been a most respected and public-spirited citizen, for he held the office of Tithingman in 1701, 1708, and 1711. He was, moreover, Constable in 1715 and Assessor from 1720 to 1727, and must have been of a warlike nature, for he was early a member of the Boston Militia, rising so high as to become a Fourth Sergeant of the Artillery Company in 1704. His respectability is further vouched for by the fact that he was a member of the church in Brattle Square, which might have been expected because of his connection with the clergy already mentioned.

We may imagine it to be due to his skill as an engraver, in which all the early men of his trade excelled, that he was appointed to visit "the Wrighting School at the Southerly End of Boston" and examine the scholars, and we can fancy John delighting the children by showing some of his best letters and flourishes, used so successfully by him on much of his silver.

In accordance with the custom of the times, he marked his silver with dies, which varied from time to time, so that we find pieces made by him marked in various ways with emblems which we suppose were changed as the dies wore out. Of these marks we have identified four types which appear to be his, and these are shown about twice normal size and described as follows:



Crude capitals in plain quatrefoil.



Crude capitals in quatrefoil with four projections.



Roman capitals in two semicircles with two projections.



Crude capitals crowned, fleur-de-lys below in shield.

The mug described in this article bears the first of these marks, which is perhaps the earliest of Edwards' dies, and this, taken in connection with the general design of the piece, might indicate that it was made about 1700. The same mark appears also on other pieces with that of Edwards' brother-in-law, John Allen, with whom Edwards seems to have been early associated in business.

HENRY REINHARDT & SON

PAINTINGS BY
OLD AND
MODERN MASTERS

NEW YORK
565 FIFTH AVENUE

CHICAGO
536 SO. MICHIGAN AVE.

PARIS
12 PLACE VENDOME



3 9088 01822 1861

SI

940

The
Ehrich Galleries

Paintings by
Old Masters
Exclusively

Including examples of the English,
French, Italian, Dutch, Flemish,
Spanish and early American schools.

707 FIFTH AVENUE
AT 55TH STREET
NEW YORK